

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 have been examined and have been rejected in view of *Lhotak* (U.S. Patent No. 5,671,345) and *Tokiwa* (JP 09-198217).

A. Claim 1

In the July 13, 2005 Amendment, Applicant argued that *Lhotak* and *Tokiwa* fail to teach or suggest that the display data contains template data that is subjected to editing, and that at least a type and position of the template data are capable of being edited via the editing, as recited in claim 1. In response, the Examiner maintains that paragraph [0036] of *Tokiwa* discloses the claimed template data (pg. 3 of Office Action). Based on the Examiner's comments, it appears that the Examiner maintains that the actual PDL interpreter 14 or the PDL format of *Tokiwa* disclose the claimed template data. However, the PDL interpreter 14 transforms data into a data format of the equipment from the PDL format. Neither the PDL interpreter 14 nor the actual PDL format teach or suggest a type of "template," where at least a type and position of the template will be edited. Based on the Examiner's rejection, Applicant is unsure what type of definition that the Examiner is providing for the term "template." Accordingly, Applicant refers the Examiner to the non-limiting embodiments in Figures 5(a) and 5(b) of the present Application, where examples of a *template* are shown as the watermarks "confidential" and "draft."

Further, the Examiner maintains that *Tokiwa* discloses the claimed inverse conversion of edited display data into a structure of spooled print data. In rejecting such recitation, the

Examiner maintains that Tokiwa's disclosure of converting data from the RGB color to the original CMYK color discloses the claimed inverse conversion (pg. 3 of Office Action). Based on such rejection, it would appear that the Examiner maintains that the RGB color data discloses the display data, while the CMYK color data discloses the spooled print data. Therefore, for the Examiner's rejection in view of Tokiwa to be consistent, the claimed template data would have to be contained within the RGB color data (i.e., alleged display data) of Tokiwa since claim 1 specifically recites that the display data "contains" the template data. As set forth above, however, the Examiner maintains that the PDL interpreter 14 discloses the template data. Nevertheless, Applicant submits that Tokiwa fails to teach or suggest such a feature.

Since Lhotak fails to cure the deficient teachings of Tokiwa, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

B. Claims 7, 10 and 17

Since claims 7, 10 and 17 disclose features that are analogous to the features discussed above for claim 1, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable for at least analogous reasons as claim 1.

C. Claims 2, 8, 9 and 12

Since claims 2, 8, 9 and 12 are dependent upon one of claims 1, 7 or 10, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

D. Claims 3 and 13

Claims 3 and 13 recite that the added-value information includes at least template data. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 3 and 13 are patentable for at least analogous reasons as set forth above for claim 1.

E. Claims 4, 5, 6, 14, 15 and 16

Since claims 4, 5, 6, 14, 15 and 16 are dependent upon one of claims 3 or 13, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

F. Claim 11

In the July 13, 2005 Amendment, Applicant argued that Tokiwa fails to teach or suggest the feature of, “detecting an object added to the print data,” as recited in claim 11. In response, the Examiner again refers to paragraph [0038] of Tokiwa and maintains that such paragraph discloses the claimed detection. However, at least based on the computer translated version of paragraph [0038], it appears that the only “detection” performed in Tokiwa is the detection that a color correction was input in step S108. Such input is the initial instruction or request to correct the color. Claim 11 does not recite that the instruction to edit an added object is detected (as in step S108 of Tokiwa). Rather, claim 11 recites that the actual *added object* itself is detected. Such detection is performed independent of the editing of contents of the object on the basis of an instruction. In this regard, Applicant instructs the Examiner to review the pertinent recitation of claim 11.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 09/240,695

In view of the above, Applicant again maintains that claim 11 is patentable over the cited references.

G. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Allison M. Tulino
Registration No. 48,294

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 29, 2005